

REMARKS

Claims 1-30 are pending. Claims 1-18 are rejected. The Applicant is adding claims 19-30 in this paper.

The Examiner has not considered non-patent literature documents and foreign patent documents cited in the Information Disclosure Statement (paper no. 5). In a separate paper, the Applicant is filing a Supplementary Information Disclosure Statement citing the documents that were not considered with copies of the documents.

The Applicant filed a Preliminary Amendment to amend the title to "A Goal Based Educational System with Support for Dynamic Tailored Feedback".

Typographical Errors

In claims 2-9 and 11-18, the Applicant has replaced "a presentation" with "the presentation." A proper antecedent basis has been established. In claims 11-18, the Applicant has replaced "An apparatus" with the "The apparatus." A proper antecedent basis has been established.

Claims Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §101

Claims 1-18 is rejected by the Office Action under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because the claimed invention is alleged to be directed to non-statutory matter. The Office Action references a two-prong test of "(1) whether the invention is within the technological arts; and (2) whether the invention produces a useful, concrete, and tangible result."

The Applicant has amended claim 1 to be directed to "A method for creating a presentation in a computer system", and is directed to an invention within the technological arts. Moreover, the Applicant has amended claims 1-18 in which the claimed invention produces a useful, concrete, and tangible result. Regarding independent claims 1 and 10, the Applicant has replaced "a student's personality" with "a personality profile of a student" which is determined from "at least one answer in response to the at least one question" in order to clarify what is

being claimed. Regarding claim 1, the Applicant has replaced the feature of “presenting information indicative of a goal” with the feature of “presenting a pre-test that includes at least one question regarding a personality profile of a student before generating the presentation.” Also, the Applicant has replaced the features of “integrating information that motivates accomplishment of the goal tailored to the student's personality” and “logic that integrates information that motivates accomplishment of the goal tailored to the student's personality” with the features of “integrating information in the presentation that motivates accomplishment of a training goal tailored to the personality profile of the student” and “logic that integrates information in the presentation that motivates accomplishment of a training goal tailored to the personality profile of the student” in claims 1 and 10, respectively. Furthermore, the Applicant has replaced the features of “monitoring progress toward the goal and providing feedback that further motivates accomplishment of the goal tailored to a student's personality” and “logic that monitors progress toward the goal and provides feedback that further motivates accomplishment of the goal tailored to a student's personality” with the features of “monitoring progress toward the training goal and providing feedback that further motivates accomplishment of the training goal tailored to the personality profile of the student” and “logic that monitors progress toward the training goal and provides feedback that further motivates accomplishment of the training goal tailored to the personality profile of the student” in claims 1 and 10, respectively. As amended, the recited steps and logic are directed to technological arts that produce a useful, concrete, and tangible result. Moreover, there is a reasonable expectation that the feedback will motivate “accomplishment of the training goal tailored to the personality profile of the student.”

The above amendments are supported by the instant specification as originally filed. For example, the instant specification discloses (Page 18, lines 11-23.):

Figure 17 illustrates how the tool suite supports student administration in accordance with a preferred embodiment. When a student first enters a course she performs a pre-test of the financial skills and fills out an information sheet about his job, level, etc. This information is reported to the Domain Model. The Profiling Component analyzes the pre-test, information sheet, and any other data to determine the specific learning needs of this student. A curriculum is dynamically configured from the Task Library for this student. The application configures its main navigational interface (if the app has one) to indicate that this student needs to learn Journalization, among other things. As the student progresses through the course, his performance indicates his proficiency is

growing more rapidly in some areas than in others. Based on this finding, his curriculum is altered to give him additional Tasks that will help him master the content he is having trouble with. Also, Tasks may be removed when he has demonstrated proficiency. While the student is performing the work in Tasks, every action he takes, the feedback he gets, and any indicators of performance are tracked in the Student Tracking Database. Periodically, part or all of the tracked data are transmitted to a central location. The data can be used to verify that the student completed all of the work, and it can be further analyzed to measure his degree of mastery of the content.

Because of the at least the above reasons, independent claims include statutory subject matter. Moreover, claims 2-9 and 11-18 depend from claims 1 and 10. The Applicant requests reconsideration of claims 1-18.

Claims Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 1-18 are rejected by the Office Action under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, for allegedly being indefinite. The Office Action alleges that the method and system of claims 1 and 10 “appear to be directed towards a method and system for presenting a presentation instead of creating a presentation.” Regarding claims 1, the Applicant has amended claim 1 to include the features of “configuring the presentation based on the personality profile of the student before **generating the presentation**” and “**integrating information in the presentation** that motivates accomplishment of a training goal tailored to the personality profile of the student.” (Emphasis added.) The above features are directed to creating a presentation. The Applicant has similarly amended claim 10 to include “logic that configures the presentation based on the personality profile of the student before generating the presentation” and “logic that integrates information in the presentation that motivates accomplishment of a training goal tailored to the personality profile of the student.” The Office Action further alleges that “the use of term personality throughout the claims is unclear.” As discussed above, the Applicant has replaced “a student’s personality” with “a personality profile of a student”. Also, the Applicant has amended claims 7 and 16 to include “a number of times the personality profile of the student matches a particular personality profile.” The above amendments clarify the definition of terms as raised by the Office Action. Thus, the Applicant requests reconsideration of claims 1-18.

Claims Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §102

The Office Action rejects claims 1-18 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by US Patent 5,727,950 (Cook). Regarding claim 1, the Applicant has amended claim 1 to include the features of “presenting a pre-test that includes at least one question regarding a personality profile of a student before generating the presentation” and “determining the personality profile of the student from at least one answer in response to the at least one question.” Cook does not teach or even suggest the above features. Cook merely observes the student’s interactions during a homework assignment so that an agent can “guide the student”. For example, Cook discloses (Column 27, lines 44-51. Emphasis added.):

FIG. 5 illustrates an exemplary segment of the interaction of the student and the system that can occur **during** a mathematics homework. It illustrates both how responses and requests are distinguished from meta-responses, and meta-requests and also how the agent, through its **observations** of the student’s current situation, and its contact with past student history, is able to guide the student better than the materials alone, which are only aware of the current context.

Cook does not teach or even suggest the features of “presenting a pre-test that includes at least one question regarding a personality profile of a student before generating the presentation” and “determining the personality profile of the student from at least one answer in response to the at least one question” but merely observes the student in the current and past situations during the homework (presentation) and guides the student. Moreover, Cook does not teach or even suggest a personality profile but merely discloses data describing “the student’s interaction with the system, the latter including current and past performance and data defining the agent’s view of the student” without presenting any questions regarding the personality profile of the student. (Column 48, lines 23-26.)

Similarly, claim 10 includes “logic that presents a pre-test that includes at least one question regarding a personality profile of a student before generating the presentation” and “logic that determines the personality profile of the student from at least one answer in response to the at least one question” and is not anticipated for at least the above reasons. Moreover, claims 2-9 and 11-18 ultimately depend from claims 1 and 10. Thus, the Applicant requests reconsideration of claims 1-18.

While claims 6 and 7 are not anticipated for at least the above reasons, claims 6 and 7 include additional features of “determining the personality profile of the student by comparing answers to prestored answers indicative of known personality profiles” and “wherein the feedback is based on a number of times the personality profile of the student matches a particular personality profile.” Cook does not teach or even suggest the above features. Regarding claim 6, Cook shows “various display personae” that appear to be merely cartoon characters that a student can select for display on a terminal screen. (Column 14, lines 31-54.) Regarding claim 7, Cook merely discloses a network on which Cook’s invention is implemented that supports TCP/IP, intranet, and the Internet. (Column 6, lines 49-53.) Similarly, claims 15 and 16 include the features of “logic that determines the personality profile of the student by comparing answers to prestored answers indicative of known personality profiles” and “wherein the feedback is based on a number of times the personality profile of the student matches a particular personality profile.”

CONCLUSIONS

The Applicant has added claims 19-30. The new claims are supported by the specification as originally filed (e.g., page 18, lines 11-23 as cited above). Please charge the additional claim fee of \$180.00 to Deposit Account No. 19-0733. The Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner consider the amendments for allowance of the claims.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: November 30, 2004

By: *Kenneth F. Smolik*
Kenneth F. Smolik
Registration No. 44,344
BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.
10 South Wacker Drive
Suite 3000
Chicago, Illinois 60606
Telephone: 312-463-5000
Facsimile: 312-463-5001